

Appl. No. 10/550,379  
Reply to Action mailed February 27, 2007  
Page 5 of 7

### **REMARKS**

Claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 10 has been amended. Support for the amendment can be found in paragraph [0031] of the present specification and Figs. 1 and 3-5. Claims 2-12 remain pending. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application, as amended, are requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

Claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hauer et al. (US 6,772,813).

Claim 10 requires at least one of hinge devices and at least one of latch devices having flexible cast rods that are integrally connected to the cover. Hauer et al. fail to disclose the present cover arrangement as required by claim 10 of at least one of hinge devices having flexible cast rods that are integrally connected to the cover. Hauer et al. discloses projection parts 30A and 30B on the cover as fitting into cells 10 on the frame. The cover, however, is a solid member from which the projection parts 30A and 30B extend. Hauer et al. do not disclose “at least one of the hinge devices . . . having flexible cast rods that are integrally connected to the cover, said flexible cast rods including projections insertable in the bearing recesses of the frame.” Hauer et al. do not disclose the flexible cast rods with respect to the hinging mechanism. Hence, Hauer et al. cannot anticipate claim 10 and the claims which depend from it.

Appl. No. 10/550,379  
Reply to Action mailed February 27, 2007  
Page 6 of 7

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**


Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hauer et al. in view of Dekel (US 5,181,793). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 2 depends from claim 10 and is patentable over Hauer et al. in view of Dekel for at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11. Dekel does not remedy the deficiencies of claim 10. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claim.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hauer et al. in view of Fuchs (WO 03/027400). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 3 depends from claim 10 and is patentable over Hauer et al. in view of Fuchs for at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11. Fuchs does not remedy the deficiencies of claim 10. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claim.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hauer et al. in view of Spiess et al. (US 5,340,232). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 9 depends from claim 10 and is patentable over Hauer et al. in view of Spiess et al. for at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11. Spiess et al. do not remedy the deficiencies of claim 10. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claim.

Appl. No. 10/550,379  
Reply to Action mailed February 27, 2007  
Page 7 of 7

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination is requested. Allowance of claims 2-11 at an early date is solicited. Claim 12 has been allowed. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: May 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: Curtis B. Hamre  
Curtis B. Hamre  
Reg. No. 29,165  
CBH/cy